

Mr. Wayne Chastain
810 Washington St., #408
Memphis, TN 38105

4/9/77

Dear Wayne,

Relet 4/5:

On the committee and the stories about it, there is nothing I can add except that most of them certainly have no basis in fact. What may be real is the report about the fragments. Seems hard to believe that the doctors would have forgotten but perhaps they did. The reality is worse than the Post quoted me on, much worse. My opinions about deMohrenschildt are unchanged. However, I think I drew a distinction between being a regular CIA employee, like an agent, and being what might be called a source. I cannot imagine a man with his experiences not being interviewed on returning home and fully debriefed. This is the essence of real intelligence collection. Spooking is not. For years I have known that he was seen by J. Walton Moore, well-known CIA station chief in deM's line of work. Nothing wrong with this. It is like a reporter when he has no conflict telling police what he thinks they should know.

I'm sure deM was sick and I'm sure that all the pressure from the nuts had much to do with this. I do not know but with what Olstman has said and done if you were deM would you not be "terrified?" He had been to the committee two weeks before the suicide.

There is more than a threat against Jim. Lane is bad, even for Lane, in his book about Jim. Wrongfully. I think that unlike him you are, innocently, and that the distinction will be clear. However, please understand that in what follows when I speak of others it is confidential. Without my doing this you cannot understand.

Lane is sick in the head. An odd schizo, able and a fuckup. I once told Les Payne that as an investigator Lane could not find pubic hair in an overworked and undercleaned whore house. Les laughed and added, "At rush hour." I don't know what kind of lawyer he is (pisspoor from his writing, which is no measure) but he is an utter incompetent in the work itself. It galls him. Here he is, in his own eyes this great man, the one who owns the subject-ask him- and in meaningful accomplishment he is limited to propaganda. In all these years, aside from enriching himself and getting himself known, there is nothing of significance he has brought to light. Once when a real story was handed to him he made a mess out of that, the Walter bit. When he had made a mess of his JFK efforts on the Hill there was nothing left but King. This meant thievery. You know how little he knew. He is not a regular thief so he has to kid himself about his stealing, making the victim the villain. In the King/Ray part he has to build himself up. He can do this only at Jim's expense.

Meanwhile he has behaved very unethically with regard to Ray. In time you'll know what I do. People are turned off by his broadcasts and send me tapes, how I know.

You recall correctly, it is the part about the ABA supposedly looking into Jim's record as Ray's counsel. First of all it does not work that way-it is always the local bar. Then there is no basis for any complaint about Jim. Confidentially he has been trying to get Ray to fire him and Ray won't.

Whatever you have in mind - and you did not give me the clues you thought you did-it has to originate with Lane. And it has to be the need of his twisted mind.

I think Jim will appreciate what you say, in part, so I'll share it with him when he returns from a trip he is now on. What you do not know is that once Jim started doing the real work on the case Bud withdrew more and more and turned it over to him. In time Jim knew what no other lawyer did. He did much work. Bud did increasingly little as his paying clients required more and more time.

The decisions on who would handle what were Bud's. Bud was abroad when Jim and I were down there on discovery. The only real preparation time he had was after we got to Memphis. Before he returned I outlined one part of the case. But went over it and agreed. His examinations at the evid. hearing came from this. Bob was worse than useless. He wasted much time we did not have. So there was no choice, Jim had to carry the load. There never were any arguments between him and Bud on this. Jim did what Bud wanted. Needed, too.

I don't think anyone will appreciate the tremendous load Jim carried at the hearing. The amount of work was incredible. He did not have even a typist or a clerk. He grew so exhausted that medication would not put him to sleep. Under the circumstances I believe his performance was superb.

The same is true of oral appeals arguments. Bud talked to me about that. He told me he felt that in Jimmy's interest Jim had to argue. Jim did not want to because Bud was senior and had courtroom experience Jim lacked. I cannot argue with Bud's decision and in fact I agreed with it and told Jim. Bud said that only Jim knew enough about the fact of the case to be able to handle questions. He was correct. I was not there but I do know there was a point at which Jim just did not understand what one of the judges was asking him about.

All the decisions were political. Arguments had nothing to do with the end. McRae's prejudice was visible from the first. But who could do anything about it?

Prentice-Hall was generous with proofs of Ark's book. It is so bad a book that the Enquirer rejected it out of hand as saying nothing. It is worse in ways the Enquirer does not understand. I have a set of proofs. This is not known and please do not tell anybody. When the book is out is time enough. When it has been in page for some time no changes could be made if anyone wanted them made.

Unfortunately you were right about Kay. Lane uses her and through his ignorance badly. It will be a slight embarrassment to her if this part gets any "emphis attention. I'm inclined to believe that will not be likely. I wish I could do something because Kay was always honest with me. And helpful. I like her. I think it is probable that with all the talking her recollection failed her, no more. But she is factually incorrect and as quoted by Lane, in quotes, very wrong. So please do not tell her. If I do get there before the book is out, not likely, I'll discuss it with her.

From Lane's account you would never know, as you now tell me, that Holloman was not in bed with Hoover until he resigned or when he resigned. One gets the impression from Lane, and it is fairly explicit in some of his statements outside the book, that Hoover sent Holloman down to Memphis and Holloman and Hoover are responsible for the King killing. This is really what turned the blacks on.

The handling of Holloman is vicious. The handling of Holloman and Reditt together is even more vicious.

I have no reason to question your representation of him. As I've told you before I sometimes disagree with your opinions but I have never known you to tell me something is a fact and I learned it was not a fact. I have known some very fine people who were FBI agents. I am not again them all. On the other hand I am critical of what some have and have not done. On an individual basis.

P-H was an notice, believe me. Especially about Lane and his dishonesties. At the same time I'm sure they have experienced counsel. So I'm not saying that what Lane does in the book is per se libel. I am, however, of the opinion that in the overall he libelled Holloman. Among others.

If Holloman would keep to himself anything I would tell him I'd be willing to let him know in advance of publication. This is a book that is going to get a major play by the publisher. The advance was in six-figures, so you know they have a hell of a lot to get back. This means heavy ads and promos. I've seen a number of full-page trade ads. In addition NBC is doing something.

I'd go farther. I can't go there and I can't send copies of the proofs. But if Holloman ever gets to Washington we are only an hour away and he can read the whole thing. It won't take that long because he can skip all the Gregory part.

What makes this much worse is that in the first 75-80% of the book the only Memphis official names is Holloman. This is an old Lane trick, to focus the reader's mind. In this case, with the publisher effort in particular, it will include the media mind.

Whether or not you discuss this with him I leave up to you. I have not even asked you how to reach him. I knew Redditt was yanked within a week of the crime. It is in frame-Up. I do not believe that if he knew about it in advance Holloman did it so "ing

could be killed. There could be no connection between the two. On the other hand, if you do speak to him, he should know that I thin all officials who had any connection with the crime after the fact failed, most of all the FBI. And that I am suing them to obtain the withheld records. And am getting them.

I will be writing about this again. Soon. For my purposes I need nothing from Holloman, I've got more than I can use now.

I wish the so-called Establishment down there could come into the modern world, as I wish the FBI could. I could get them all over the agony, I'm sure without political consequences in Memphis and with benefir to the FBI. I guess you've heard me say this before. In my own way I'm going to try

Cohen article: Bullshit.

Beird not only irrelevant but not his first story. In his first there was not even a suggestion of the FBI offering him \$500,000. I'm sure it did not happen. I spoke to him about 11/75. I was not impressed with his dependability and I was impressed with the total irrelevance. What appearsk to have been the case is that he was suspected of racial dynamiting and he was tested by the police, not the FBI, with an offer to off King.

Whether Hagin is a nat of just evil is immaterial. I amx certain Holloman had no connection with the crime, that it was not Memphis based and that the FBI did not do it.

However you believe Seigenthaler thinks Ellington and Armour were wu ed in I do not believe it.

Id Bobby Kennedy had been friendly with the ^uookers you'd never know it from the Hooker record.

Wish I had time for more. Best and thanks,